



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/724,269	11/28/2000	Simon Kasif	0918.2033-000 (P00-3373)	7893
7590 10/31/2005			EXAMINER	
IP Administration			ZEMAN, MARY K	
Legal Departme	ent, M/S 35			
Hewlett-Packard Company			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 272400			1631	
Fort Collins, Co	O 80527-2400			

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/724,269	KASIF ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mary K. Zeman	1631				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 A	ugust 2005					
	s action is non-final.					
	, , , / -					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims	, , ,					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,3,7-9,11,16,22-25,27-30,34 and 37</u>	is/are pending in the application					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2, 3, 7-9, 11, 16, 22-25, 27-30, 34 and 37</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er er					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	- · ·	• •				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	- -	ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Burea	, ,,	d				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ea.				
A440-b						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) 🗖 Indo-et 0	(DTO 442)				
2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	_	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/724,269

Art Unit: 1631

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 2, 3, 7-9, 11, 16, 22-25, 27-30, 34 and 37 are pending in this application.

Applicant's arguments filed 8/10/05 have been fully considered but they are not completely persuasive.

The Declaration filed on 8/10/05 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been fully considered but is ineffective to overcome the Lobanov reference.

The Declaration is not signed by all the inventors as set forth in MPEP 715.04. The declaration has been signed by LOGAN, and MORENO, but not by listed inventors KASIF and SUZEK.

The Declaration does not clearly set forth that the acts described were performed in the USA, a NAFTA, or WTO country. See MPEP 715.07(c)

MPEP 715.04: The following parties may make an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131:

- (A) All the inventors of the subject matter claimed.
- (B) An affidavit or declaration by less than all named inventors of an application is accepted where it is shown that less than all named inventors of an application invented the subject matter of the claim or claims under rejection. For example, one of two joint inventors is accepted where it is shown that one of the joint inventors is the sole inventor of the claim or claims under rejection.
- (C) **> If a petition under 37 CFR 1.47 was granted or the application was accepted under 37 CFR 1.42 or 1.43, the affidavit or declaration may be signed by the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant or the legal representative, where appropriate.<.
- (D) The assignee or other party in interest when it is not possible to produce the affidavit or declaration of the inventor. Ex parte Foster, 1903 C.D. 213, 105 O.G. 261 (Comm'r Pat. 1903).

Affidavits or declarations to overcome a rejection of a claim or claims must be made by the inventor or inventors of the subject matter of the rejected claim(s), a party qualified under 37 CFR 1.42, 1.43, or 1.47, or the assignee or other party in interest when it is not possible to produce the affidavit or declaration of the inventor(s). Thus, where all of the named inventors of a pending application are not inventors of every claim of the application, any affidavit under 37 CFR 1.131 could be signed by only the inventor(s) of the subject matter of the rejected claims. Further, where it is shown that a joint inventor is deceased, refuses to sign, or is otherwise unavailable, the signatures of the remaining joint inventors are sufficient. However, the affidavit or declaration, even though signed by fewer than all the joint inventors, must show completion of the invention by all of the joint inventors of the subject matter of the claim(s) under rejection. In re Carlson, 79 F.2d 900, 27 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1935).

MPEP 715.07(c): The 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration must contain an allegation that the acts relied upon to establish the date prior to the reference or activity were carried out in

Application/Control Number: 09/724,269

Art Unit: 1631

this country or in a NAFTA country or WTO member country. See 35 U.S.C. 104.Under 37 CFR 1.131(a), which provides for the establishment of a date of completion of the invention in a NAFTA or WTO member country, as well as in the United States, an applicant can establish a date of completion in a NAFTA member country on or after December 8, 1993, the effective date of section 331 of Public Law 103-182, the North American Free Trade Agreement Act, and can establish a date of completion in a WTO member country other than a NAFTA member country on or after January 1, 1996, the effective date of section 531 of Public Law 103-465, the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. Acts occurring prior to the effective dates of NAFTA or URAA may be relied upon to show completion of the invention; however, a date of completion of the invention may not be established under 37 CFR 1.131 before December 8, 1993 in a NAFTA country or before January 1, 1996 in a WTO country other than a NAFTA country.

Claims 2, 3, 7-9, 11, 16, 22-25, 27-30, 34 and 37 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lobanov et al. (US 6,834,239) for the reasons set forth in the previous office action..

The claims, as amended, are drawn to methods of classifying genome sequences through the use of feature vectors which represent fragments of genome sequences. Claim 34 is the independent method claim, setting forth providing training fragments, training sequences, and training vectors which lead to the creation of differing classes. These training sets and classes are used to classify a subject sequence. Claim 37 is the independent apparatus claim.

Lobanov et al. (US 6,834,239; having priority to at least 9/28/00) discloses methods of classification of products (proteins). Each building block (fragment; amino acid) of the product (protein) is assigned a feature vector, which is used as a training subset for determining classes which relate to the features. Predicted or computer values based on probability f existence can be used in the methods. The values can be "determined, estimated or predicted." The values can be retrieved from an information storage device such as a database. The building block set is identified which refers to at least one reagent or fragment which comprises the target product. A supervised machine learning approach is used for the training and classification. After the initial training is complete, the method can be used on target or subject sequences for their classification. The methods of Lobanov can be used on multiple types of products, including polypeptides. Lobanov et al disclose programmed computer systems for performing the methods which meet the limitations of the apparatus claims.

Art Unit: 1631

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary K Zeman whose telephone number is (571) 272 0723

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, PhD can be reached on (571) 272 0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

MARY K. ZEMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER